

From: Joelle Cole
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 11:14 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Joelle Cole (rjsjeloc@attbi.com) writes:

I thank you for your efforts and your comments today. You and Mr. Copps were speaking (succinctly, I might add) for me and millions of Americans who see this profound change in the atmosphere of our country as, well, just scary.

Your influence and input have NEVER been as important as it is now.
Your are speaking for many and we appreciate your sincerity.

Thank You,
Joelle Cole

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.246.210.210
Remote IP address: 12.246.210.210

From: Brett Levy
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 11:14 AM
Subject: NO MEDIA CONCENTRATION

Vote against media concentration! Once we start, it's tough to go back, and we need more voices, not fewer, to be heard!!!

Brett Levy
Public School Teacher
California

Do you Yahoo!?
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

From: J. O'Neal
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 11:14 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

J. O'Neal (thothkraft) writes:

Thank mr. Adelstein for standing up for the broad American public landscape and not voting in favor of this action. I watched as you spoke on cnn and was at least glad that our freedoms were not handed over without a fight.

I would please beg you to speak openly about what happened so that we all have a perfect understanding of what happened.

thank you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 152.163.252.198
Remote IP address: 152.163.252.198

From: Lwimmer@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 11:14 AM
Subject: TODAY'S HEARING

LAURIE WIMMER WHELAN
3310 NORTHWEST LURAY TERRACE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97210

June 2, 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Chairman Michael K. Powell: mpowell@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy: kabernat@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps: mcopps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin: kjmweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein: jadelste@fcc.gov
Washington, DC

Dear Commissioners,

I have been reading with alarm about the hearing you will hold today to consider relaxing the rules for media ownership. I have also learned of the millions of dollars spent in lavish convention travel for FCC associates, paid for by the very industry you are charged with regulating. I am, as a citizen, deeply concerned. Your vote today will tell America whether the appearance of impropriety has crossed the line to outright corruption, as some brave voices have dared to charge.

As to the policy question before you, I am aware that you have heard from hundreds of thousands of average citizens, nearly universally opposing the relaxation of media anti-monopoly rules. If a hearings process is to mean anything at all - and not be simply a sham - you must heed the wishes of U.S. citizens and vote NO to this dangerous proposal.

Diversity of opinion, objectivity, truth - these are the values I was taught to hold dear. I was trained as and employed for a time as a news reporter myself, and I know how difficult it is to maintain those values in a commercial world. Concentrating media power in the hands of a few (a trend already under way with existing regulation) militates against those values. Already, Fox and CNN, to name only two examples, regularly broadcast slanted, opinion-saturated newscasts that barely resemble the objective reporting I grew up watching. This brave new world has little room for a Walter Cronkite or a Dan Rather. Don't make it worse. Don't further enable the corporate media machine to sanitize our collective world view and leave us all the weaker as a nation.

The eyes of the nation are upon you.

Sincerely,

Laurie Wimmer Whelan

From: leslie gannon
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:22 PM
Subject: extend current hearings

Preliminary hearings should be extended. Why spend a great deal of tax money to defend against legal suits expected to arise out of the policies of the present FCC Commission when extended public hearings can clarify the parameters of FCC policy and how the people feel about it? How does the FCC define its responsibilities to a diverse public?

I would like to know the following:

Is the FCC responsible for standards in programming?

Is the FCC responsible to insure not only national and local variety, but must the FCC insure diverse opinion itself in a meaningful way?

Is the FCC obliged to create equal opportunity, i.e., is it obligated to support free expression of opinion which, in fact, opposes an administration's policy? Would this not be a requisite of Free Speech under the First Amendment? How would this be done and when?

or

Is the FCC simply concerned with commercial issues?

How can a Federal Commission dedicated to the public air waves simply confine itself to issues of economic feasibility, for example, the notion of competition without examining what competition truly means from a legal standpoint? Many corporations have entities or associations which outwardly appear separate, but, functionally or even legally, are not separate, especially from influential public servants.

How would 'competition' be assured without a thorough investigation and some sort of written declaration made by corporations agreeing to penalty under law for practices of secrecy and/or exploitation of broadcasting rights granted by the public? Define "exploitation."

What are the limitation rights of free speech for corporations? Are you willing to define and set such limitations at this time?

Is the FCC willing to provide free broadcasting on an equal time basis for political candidates who disagree with a President on political policy even though they have been appointed by that President? Realistically, can only wealthy persons - persons who can "buy time" on public airwaves run for office? What is the responsibility of the FCC in this regard? This is a very important issue because if money defines the abridgment of free speech, then the FCC, being a Federal agency, most probably has some Constitutional requirements to meet.

Would the FCC create a "free speech channel" on television and radio dedicated full time in every community for the purpose of presenting open challenges to current public policy? Or would the government create a national free newspaper, for instance, called "Dissent"? In other words, can opponents of an administration (any administration) have Equal, free time to present their case so that the public may be duly informed? Would this not be protecting the vote, and would this not be an obligation of the FCC in so

far as the vote is connected to public information? What is the connection between the vote and information? So far, I am not aware of anything in FCC public statements which addresses the relation between protecting the vote via protecting information, public obligation. I would put protection of the vote pretty high on the responsibilities of the FCC.

Privilege has direct relations to responsibility. Let us speak less about profit and gain, and more about obligations to the peoples of this country.

Leslie Gannon, Victor, MT

CC: max@senate.gov, washington.journal@c-span.org

From: Zager John R PUBO
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:25 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Commissioner,

Please accept this notice of my opposition to any action by the Federal Communications Commission which would operate to lessen restrictions on ownership of media outlets.

Your Commission is scheduled to vote on Monday 02 June 03 regarding this relaxation of the requirements regarding ownership of media outlets.

I am opposed to any such relaxation of requirements. In fact I think the previous relaxation of requirements enacted during the administration of former President Clinton was a gross mistake from which the consuming public, and hence myself, has enjoyed no benefit and has even sustained a serious detriment.

I have tried repeatedly in the past 2 weeks to submit this notice to the commission using the "ECFS" (Electronic Comment Filing System) option at the FCC website. In each instance I met with frustration. That portal is clearly unsuitable for the purpose of citizen participation. I have therefore resorted to sending email to each of the commissioners in the expectation that my opposition will be recorded.

I believe you should vote to tighten, not loosen, regulations regarding ownership of media outlets. Failing which, I request that you extend the time in which you will make your decision to such a date whereby public comments, including my own, can reasonably be obtained.

Thank you for your kind attention to my comment and for your continued vigilance for the public interest in matters of publicly-regulated communications.

Sincerely and with best regards,

John Zager
P.O. Box 2555
Boston, MA 02130

johnzager@aol.com

From: Sue Knight
To: Mike Powell, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:40 AM
Subject: Media Rules Change

Dear Mr. Powell: It is the hope of many citizens, as you well know, that you will consider their voices when they say they are strongly against your plans to deregulate in favor of large media corporations. You cannot expect us to believe that this would be advantageous since we have already been witness to the moronic range of reality shows, the channels which proclaim to be news but instead are entertainment, and the more than I can count "Christian" extremist, and Spanish channels for which I must pay, but for which I have no use. A better use for this discussion would be to investigate why we are offered reruns of reruns, and biased news stations which are actually meant to be entertainment and offer nothing for those searching for truth. We instead are subjected to higher cable rates, and hatefilled mudslinging and name calling of those whose views oppose those on the right. Certainly you cannot believe this situation will improve with more of Clear Channel, and Rupert Murdoch. It is not a democracy when one must search for the truth in news, after all, isn't that what we were preaching in the Middle East? We will not be silenced because you sell out the peoples air waves. When you disregard our concerns it is blatantly arrogant, and the first questions one must ask is what are the reasons those in charge of the airwaves would sell out the people they should be protecting? Money, power, indifference, or a better offer would be the only reasons I could think of. I hope you will reconsider your determined stand on this decision. Sincerely,
 Suzanne Knight, 30 Colonial Road, Holden, Ma. 01520

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: GDC30A@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:43 AM
Subject: June 2

Please vote NO.

Glenn Carlson

From: Dan O'Boyle
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:43 AM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Mr. Dan O'Boyle
Valley Springs, CA 95252-9248

From: Kelly Harless
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:44 AM
Subject: Opposed to FCC Rule Changes

I am vehemently opposed to the proposed rule changes under consideration by the FCC. These changes are a threat to the foundation of democracy in this country. The fact that the FCC is ignoring the opinion of the vast majority of the American people expressed by the overwhelming response in opposition to the proposed rule changes the FCC has received -- is a travesty.

Sincerely,
Kelly Harless
Solana Beach CA

From: carol anderson
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:47 AM
Subject: STRENGTHEN FCC REGULATIONS

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy: I urge you to strengthen FCC regulations in regard to multi-media ownership by a few moguls. Our American democracy demands that all points of view be heard....not just the far right. Critical thinking is not about fault finding. It is about having an informed opinion on a given issue by being able to find out who each of the stakeholders connected to that issue is, and to find out what each of their positions is. We have seen the direction that de-regulation has taken us (think ENRON and the manipulation of electricity supplies & the unconscionable rates). Yours is not an Administration that plays by the rules, even when they are in place, and it might be worthwhile to reflect that the majority of the American people did not elect this administration. The sacrifice of American lives to bring freedom to the Iraqi people (since there does not seem to be any weapons of mass destruction) will be in vain, if we lose our democratic freedoms at home. I would hope that we can do better in this country to bring ALL points of view freely to the public rather than the narrow viewpoints allowed under communism or fascism.

Mrs. Carol Anderson AND 3 registered voters

From: BK
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:48 AM
Subject: Please do not relax media monopoly rules any further

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I am writing to you to ask that you do not relax media monopoly restrictions any further. In fact, I believe the rules need to be reinstated that have already been relaxed in the past. Already the conglomerates have managed to limit the voice heard to one in many areas, thus threatening democracy as we know it. In the Idaho Panhandle, parts of western Washington, and all of northwestern Montana's written media is already owned by one privately held conglomerate, Hagadone Corporation. The owner, Duane Hagadone, also has interest in property development, radio, mining, power, and many other areas. This has created a threat to our democratic principles as the real news goes unreported if it is in conflict with his personal interests. If you relax these rules any further, we will have no chance to have our voices be heard or to hear any other side to a story. In fact, this conglomerate already controls the communication in this area to a point that it presently severely limits the views heard at the sacrifice of the public good. If any more of our media is purchased by this conglomerate, we will have no voice at all. This has led me to determine that the rules need to be tightened, not further relaxed. I understand that only 11% of the market is owned by conglomerates. This may sound like an acceptable percentage, but not when you live in an area that 100% of the written press is owned by one. What this percentage tells me is that there are many areas similar to Kalispell, where monopolies concentrate all of their ownership, and others where they own none. Believe me, I wish I lived in an area where I could hear more than one side of an issue, but that is impossible here. It does not matter if I purchase the Kalispell Daily Inter Lake, the Lake Country Leader, the Hungry Horse News, the Whitefish Pilot, or a number of other papers from the surrounding area as, every single one is owned by Hagadone Corporation and only gives one point of view on selected subjects that do not counter his opinion and politics. Our problem here is not freedom, it is censorship, based on what is best for the self-interests of the owner. This is not acceptable and further relaxing these rules will only make this situation far worse.

Supporting documents are available at your request.

Thank you for your time,

Brenda Kitterman
368 S. Many Lakes Drive
Kalispell, MT 59901
brenda@kalispell.net

From: Don Gerring
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:01 AM
Subject: The duty of the FCC commissioners

Please do not allow the greedy corpacorations, the Republican party and this corrupt administration to influence you! Please do not allow fewer people and corporations to control more media! Protect the best interests of the American public, as you are required to do! We we will be watching! DON GERRING

From: Ryan Horstmyer
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:02 AM
Subject: You are making a horrible decision

You are going to destroy our nation's primary institution of information, the free press, which eventually won't be so free. The likes of Rupert Murdoch are going to pollute the minds of America's citizens with their demagoguery.

Your decision is a lousy one. You are going to blatantly disregard overwhelming public opinion. You should be ashamed.

You still have time, though. Oppose media deregulation on Monday. Otherwise, Congress will save America from your insanity.

JUST DO THE RIGHT THING! THIS COUNTRY IS NOT READY FOR A DEREGULATED MEDIA!
DIVERSITY, INDEPENDENCE AND HONESTY MUST BE ENSURED!

--Ryan V. Horstmyer

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: pat duclos
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:10 AM
Subject: June 2, 2003 Commission Meeting on Media Ownership

Audio/Video Events

This page provides free worldwide access via the Internet to live and pre-recorded webcasts of selected FCC events. All events are held in the FCC Commission Meeting Room (Room TW-C305, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C.) unless noted otherwise. Links for live events will be activated approximately 5 minutes prior to the published start time.

Our media server is configured to support up to 200 simultaneous Internet users. Your RealPlayer will display a message indicating that the capacity has been reached whenever you attempt to access the webcast while there are already 200 or more other users accessing the webcast. For a fee, meetings can also be viewed live over George Mason University's Capitol Connection. The Capitol Connection also carries Commission meetings live via the Internet. To purchase these services call (703) 993-3100 or go to www.capitolconnection.gmu.edu.

All live webcasts are recorded and are available for free through links on the A/V Archives box in the left-hand column of this page. Copies of the meetings on VHS tape are available for purchase through the Commission's Copy Contractor, CACI Productions, 341 Victory Drive, Herndon, VA 20170, telephone number (703) 834-1470, Ext 19; fax number (703) 834-0111.

I am writing to you regarding the June 2 Commission Meeting on Media Ownership. I am a voter and consumer who does not want regulations changed that would allow a few wealthy individuals and companies to control the media. When money is all it takes to obtain access to the airwaves to exercise "free speech" then there will not be "free speech" any more. It is not "fair" competition when money is the only measure. Quality and diversity and open debate of ideas is what matters and what needs to be preserved and protected by the FCC. That's why there is an FCC and other regulatory agencies. They exist for the purpose of helping to protect the rights of the people and to preserve the democracy.

Patricia Ann Duclos
7260 Hayden Ave
Sebastopol, Ca 95472
cricket@sonic.net

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: pat duclos
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:14 AM
Subject: Commission Meeting on Media Ownership

I am writing to you regarding the June 2 Commission Meeting on Media Ownership. I am a voter and consumer who does not want regulations changed that would allow a few wealthy individuals and companies to control the media. When money is all it takes to obtain access to the airwaves to exercise "free speech" then there will not be "free speech" any more. It is not "fair" competition when money is the only measure. Quality and diversity and open debate of ideas is what matters and what needs to be preserved and protected by the FCC. That's why there is an FCC and other regulatory agencies. They exist for the purpose of helping to protect the rights of the people and to preserve the democracy.

Patricia Ann Duclos
7260 Hayden Ave
Sebastopol, Ca 95472
cricket@sonic.net

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Hutch
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:17 AM
Subject: June 2 meeting

Ms. Abernathy -

I am writing to ask that you do *not* pass the proposed rules allowing further concentration of ownership that is set to be voted on June 2.

As a concerned citizen, and as a member of the telecommunications and electronics industries, I have watched with dismay as the consequences of the Telecommunications Act of 1997 have played themselves out.

Many bills are the subject over-blown conjecture before they are passed, but this act has been singularly stark in failing the promises made by those who supported it and singularly alarming in fulfilling the darkest fears of those who opposed it.

With such a clear-cut model to show the expected consequences, I believe it imperative for the health of the public resources which you steward that this trend not be allowed any further sway.

P Hutchison.

cc
Powell
Copps
Martin
Adelstein

From: Guy Kramer
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:17 AM
Subject: FCC Deregulation

On June 2nd, the FCC, without consulting the public, will decide whether to repeal the ownership caps set by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, which limit the number of media outlets one company can own. This deregulation will allow the dissemination of information to be tightly controlled by a few individuals, as the biggest media giants buy up and monopolize smaller markets, drowning out the voices of less powerful, less influential media outlets.

The crux of the debate, really, is over the control of information. The supporters of deregulation want to put that control into fewer hands, into the hands of an unbelievably small minority. What happens when a single individual or close-knit junta controls an increasingly larger piece of the media pie?

The FCC's primary charter is to ensure that the media is diverse, competitive, and locally influenced. What have we seen since the Telecommunications Act of 1996? Clear Channel now owns over 1200 radio stations, most of which feature abrasive "news talk" hosts, all of whom promulgate highly conservative opinions and disparage any individuals who differ from their line of thought. Wouldn't a diverse market feature some liberal views? ClearChannel doesn't think so. The owners simply don't want opinions contrary to their own flitting about on their airwaves. It would be different if these programs really were "fair and balanced", if they featured co-hosts with polarity in their views and debated both sides of every contentious issue. But this is not the case. Music that is deemed "anti-American" is taken off play lists. Artists and citizens who criticize the actions of the current administration are blacklisted and banned from the Clear Channel airwaves. That doesn't sound like free speech. The "news talk" doesn't sound like free press. It sounds like propaganda. And propaganda is a tool, a tool for control, in this case a means of controlling dissent through intimidation and public opinion by directing which stories get reported and which ones don't.

During a senate commerce committee meeting regarding the FCC's upcoming decision, Senator Sununu, an ardent supporter of relaxing media ownership caps, said in so many words that just because an individual owns hundreds of newspapers and media outlets, doesn't mean that they will be calling their editors to dictate what will or will not be reported on. Apparently Senator Sununu doesn't watch FOX news, where the opinions of its owner, Rupert Murdoch, are reiterated by 100% of his editorialists.

But maybe Sen. Sununu is right. Why not give control of the media to a handful of people? Maybe we'll get lucky and that small minority will actually put the interests of the public first, making localism, diversity, and competition top priority. But has that happened since 1996 Telecommunications Act, which removed many ownership limits? Is there more diversity of opinion? Is FOX news corp. a source of information that provides "fair and balanced" reporting, or does the no-spin approach make you dizzy?

Since we're in the giving mood, why not just hand over control of the US government to one individual and let him be dictator? If we pick ten people at random to become absolute dictators of our country, some of them may turn out to be wise and benevolent leaders. But there is also a good chance that the power given to such an individual will be abused, which is why that isn't allowed to happen. The potential for abuse, the potential for disaster is too great. Why should control of our mass media be different? It shouldn't be of course, but the problem is that most people underestimate how much power would be put into the hands of those few individuals that end up owning the bulk of the media industry. Information is power. As gatekeepers, the new owners can control what passes through those gates to reach the masses, prevent people from hearing what they don't want heard. And the ownership won't be limited to just radio and television, but will include newspapers, magazines, movie studios, book publishers, internet, cable and satellite providers. Controversial books will no longer be burnt; they will simply never be printed. The most obvious example of what is to come is the complete absence of any news coverage relating to the upcoming FCC meeting, the lack of any sort of debate or discourse in the largest news media providers.

Joseph Goebbels, the minister of propaganda for the Nazi Party, was a huge proponent of tight centralization within the media and realized that control of the radio waves meant control of the masses:

"A government that has determined to bring a nation together so that it is once more a center of power in the scales of great world events has not only the right, but the duty, to subordinate all aspects of the nation to its goals, or at least ensure that they are supportive. That is also true for the radio. The more significant something is in influencing the will of the broad masses, the greater its responsibility to the future of the nation"

-Joseph Goebbels

What were the consequences of Goebbels' eventual monopoly of all Germany's media? Shall we ask the survivors of the death camps how the media monopoly contributed to diversity?

The current owners of course aren't Nazis. But it doesn't matter. Deregulating the media opens the doors to fascism. It creates the potential for a small group with an agenda to take over the flow of information and influence public opinion. Monopolistic control of the media in Germany by the National Socialists eventually led to 50 million deaths. We live in a nuclear world now. History can repeat itself if people fail to learn from the lessons of the past. The consequences are simply too large to ignore.

Guy Kramer
234 Circle Drive
Greeneville, TN 37745
423-639-8964

From: Lisa Prigozen
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:26 AM
Subject: Please say no to relaxing ownership limits!!

Hello, I am writing to urge you to think about the decision at hand tomorrow.

Every child in America is taught that

1 - Open debate is what keeps a democracy healthy, what enables Americans to think and consider their actions and their opinions, stay informed, and participate in making our country the best it can be. Our democracy is founded on the premise that participatory discussion is what makes democracy work;

and

2 - Competition is what keeps capitalism healthy. Competition incentivizes companies to perform better, and better serve consumers. One of the main tenets of competitive capitalism is that there are no barriers to entry into the market, meaning that anyone can join in the competition to figuratively build a better mousetrap. The result is that companies will be forced to provide the best products and services to make money, and America has better mousetraps. If there aren't many mousetrap makers, the few that remain have no reason to make good mousetraps since consumers have no choice. The result is poorer services, less efficiency, and a failure of the market to optimize our country's great potential.

American democracy and capitalism are systems which have served our country well. Please, please, please, I beg you, urge you, implore you to consider how incredibly deeply the FCC's proposed ownership limit changes will effect both our wonderful democracy and our already ailing economy. America needs choices, many voices, many points of view to represent our wonderfully diverse country. That is what has made this country so great, and if you take that away and let just a handful of companies decide what all american see on the news, read in the papers, watch on tv, listen to on the radio... well, you can imagine how difficult it would be for alternative opinions to be heard. But it is precisely these opinions which must be heard so that Americans can defend their right to free speech, open debate, and participatory democracy that has been the bedrock of our society since the bill of rights!!!

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

From: Lisa Prigozen
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:26 AM
Subject: Please say no to relaxing ownership limits!!

Hello, I am writing to urge you to think about the decision at hand tomorrow.

Every child in America is taught that

1 - Open debate is what keeps a democracy healthy, what enables Americans to think and consider their actions and their opinions, stay informed, and participate in making our country the best it can be. Our democracy is founded on the premise that participatory discussion is what makes democracy work;

and

2 - Competition is what keeps capitalism healthy. Competition incentivizes companies to perform better, and better serve consumers. One of the main tenets of competitive capitalism is that there are no barriers to entry into the market, meaning that anyone can join in the competition to figuratively build a better mousetrap. The result is that companies will be forced to provide the best products and services to make money, and America has better mousetraps. If there aren't many mousetrap makers, the few that remain have no reason to make good mousetraps since consumers have no choice. The result is poorer services, less efficiency, and a failure of the market to optimize our country's great potential.

American democracy and capitalism are systems which have served our country well. Please, please, please, I beg you, urge you, implore you to consider how incredibly deeply the FCC's proposed ownership limit changes will effect both our wonderful democracy and our already ailing economy. America needs choices, many voices, many points of view to represent our wonderfully diverse country. That is what has made this country so great, and if you take that away and let just a handful of companies decide what all american see on the news, read in the papers, watch on tv, listen to on the radio... well, you can imagine how difficult it would be for alternative opinions to be heard. But it is precisely these opinions which must be heard so that Americans can defend their right to free speech, open debate, and participatory democracy that has been the bedrock of our society since the bill of rights!!!

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

From: Billpeacesr@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:34 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Honorables Powell,Abernathy,Copps,Martin and Adelstein:

Please DO NOT lessen or relax the broadcast ownership rules now in effect that protect our right to hear and receive all sides of important issues. I respectfully request that you do not allow the super media companies to dominate the news in any way.

The current rules protect the American public from such monopolies and have served us very well for many decades. It is essential that Americans receive more than one point of view, especially concerning political debate.

Sincerely, William D. Peace..Leland, MI. 49654

CC: Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Daniel Kipp
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:45 AM
Subject: NO on de-regulation, please!!

To whom it may concern: can you search your heart of hearts, and honestly say that you think that it is in the people's best interest, to take the people's airwaves, and to further limit the views from, what, 5 corporations, now? To make it okay for a fewer number of corporations, or people with power, for example Murdoch, to limit what is seen by the American people, further than it already is? For example, compare the REST OF THE WORLD'S Press with America's press coverage of the American war in Iraq. The american coverage was so vanilla, so much a pep rally, compared to the reality of the war.

If nothing else, it is a bad idea to limit the views that are seen. Case in point: I give you Totalitarianistic Russia and Germany under the 3rd Reich. Now THAT is consolidation of the press, and also very evil.

I urge you to vote against de-regulation.

Thank you for your time,
Daniel

From: R. & V. Pritchett
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:46 AM
Subject: Let the Voices of America Be Heard

The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Mr. Richard L. Pritchett
El Sobrante, CA 94803-1627

From: Maja Brugos
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Barbara.Lee@mail.house.gov
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:47 AM
Subject: FCC: Against Media Deregulation (MB Docket No. 02-277)

TITLE: 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (MB Docket No. 02-277); Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers (MM Docket No. 01-235); Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets (MM Docket No. 01-317); and Definition of Radio Markets (MM Docket No. 00-244).

I do not support the relaxing of media ownership rules

I believe the free flow of information through diverse media ownership is paramount to democracy. Key tenets of democracy are freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The relaxation of media ownership laws will give citizens less choice for their media outlets.

As media conglomerates are allowed to grow, small independent news organizations will lose their voice, and the free flow of ideas will be restricted. As the voices of the media conglomerates get louder, the independent outlets will get quieter and disappear. I am concerned that the American public will become less educated as a result of media conglomerates further monopolizing the market.

I do not feel that the public has had adequate time to comment on these issues. I am writing to urge that the FCC postpone its June 2, 2003 vote on this issue so the public may have adequate time to research this issue and comment.

It is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Sincerely,
Maja Brugos
3701 Elston Avenue
Oakland, CA 94602

From: Erich Tisnado
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Barbara.Lee@mail.house.gov
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:53 AM
Subject: FCC: Against Media Deregulation (MB Docket No. 02-277)

TITLE: 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (MB Docket No. 02-277); Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers (MM Docket No. 01-235); Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets (MM Docket No. 01-317); and Definition of Radio Markets (MM Docket No. 00-244).

I do not support the relaxing of media ownership rules.

I believe the free flow of information through diverse media ownership is paramount to democracy. Key tenets of democracy are freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The relaxation of media ownership laws will give citizens less choice for their media outlets.

As media conglomerates are allowed to grow, small independent news organizations will lose their voice, and the free flow of ideas will be restricted. As the voices of the media conglomerates get louder, the independent outlets will get quieter and disappear. I am concerned that the American public will become less educated as a result of media conglomerates further monopolizing the market.

I do not feel that the public has had adequate time to comment on these issues. I am writing to urge that the FCC postpone its June 2, 2003 vote on this issue so the public may have adequate time to research this issue and comment.

It is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Sincerely,
Erich Tisnado
3701 Elston Avenue
Oakland, CA 94602

From: BoasrplnV@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:56 AM
Subject: dim the lights of freedom

These are various letters I've sent to various "media outlets".

You say there are so many choices out there...but only if you have a spare one to three THOUSAND dollars to access it.

The public airwaves are of the PUBLIC TRUST FUND. Our tax dollars and investment developed the technology (as with MANY pharmaceuticals, land trusts, etc.) that you ought to sense the robbery you are proposing.

As you can see, consolidation that will begin in just a few hours will wipe out the opinions of both the Pope and the Dixie Chicks.

I surely hope that when your children become one-dimensional, attention fractured sheep; you will realise that, at your hands, today's de-regulation actions will lead to a population so dim, that sociopaths shall surely be the norm.

Surely, at least HALF of the programming should be just programming.....but now, 34% to 48% are ads between show segments with an additional 10% added to the bottom third of the screen during shows. We now are above the 50% marks (55%!).

Letter to Milwaukee Channel 12--Nov 2000

Hey Jerry, show'em your journalistic integrity, for once.....6 HOURS of Football on the night before the election and you all are still delaying Nightline and Politically Incorrect to show people in a bar, toasting millionaire jocks and offering them plastic horses and fake money.....if you do not properly maintain the Public Trust provided to you, it will be taken away.

Letter to Mr. Steve Case December 1999

Please note my strong protest of placing advertisements in MAD Magazine for the first time in 46 years.

The simple pleasure of reading MAD, uninterrupted by sales pitches, has been one of the most important aspects of my life. For over thirty years I've learned to read, laugh and learn through its unique medium.

Are we on a path where all content (which you now control most of) is interrupted every few seconds, or even constantly, by sales pitches?

Cannot someone buy and read something, without being asked every few seconds to buy another thing?

I would proffer that these affronts to ones deep attention will lead viewers to be so fractured in their attention span that people will no longer sense any value in your products. Further, the bad karma will lead to AOL stock to tumble 90%.

,Letter to UPN

How can I put this kindly? Between Time/Warner Cable weakening the UPN signal during StarTrekVoyager, the UPN logo remaining on all the time so that every time someone views a console they're staring at the logo, cutting out the last season only to show it in a ten hour marathon and in-your-face wrestling type intros...I have found one of the best bits of tv viewing considerably annoying.

Please save this show from becoming just more noise.

[Time/Warner now weakens signals (e.g. Oxygen--except Sundays) to save money]

Tribune Privacy Policy

"...Information can be collected and used by third parties without our knowledge and may result in unsolicited messages from other individuals or third parties."

Honestly, I don't know why I bother (but this will be the last time).
 It takes ten minutes for my broadband connection to start.
 Your music newsgroups are constantly missing pieces.
 I will tell you (again) that these are not copyrighted materials.
 I've challenged you to try and download these clips and you've shuddered away.
 Your service is poor and there are plenty (better providers) to take your place.
 Perhaps the thousands of dollars I pay to you for unserved services means nothing, but it will truly be your loss.
 The true "Bottom Line" is SERVICE....then, maybe we'll sign-up with you again.
 \$45- broadband
 \$50- 2Aol Accounts
 \$110- Cable Bill
 \$2500 per year, hey maybe, with some broken down modems, I could buy Time/Warner, whadya' think?

Statement by C. Michael Powell:

"Lack of information about what was said and when it was broadcast should not be allowed to derail our enforcement of the laws."
 .. what about what was NOT reported?

To Time /Warner/Aol Cable:

I've yet to receive info regarding dropping WHA-21 PBS to add another block of religious programming. Since you argue that the PBS stations had overlapping content, does this not apply to channels 21 and 18 both showing the "700 Club" simultaneously? Copies of my request have been sent to various, concerned Federal entities. Please send info promptly as this will aid my decision whether to continue any of your services. These include digital cable, 3 movie premium packs, roadrunner, aol, time mag, etc.
 Thank you for your prompt reply,

AOL offers help for phone scams...Searched AOL for "phone scam"
 Below is the output (links removed)

Search for "phone scam" on:

Find Best Prices on "phone scam" at DealTime
 Encyclopedia articles that mention "phone scam"
 Home Pages about "phone scam"
 Kids Only sites about "phone scam"
 boasrplnv@aol.com

From: james tichenor
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:57 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

james tichenor (tichenor@mit.edu) writes:

I have read of your plans to ease the limits on the number of media outlets you will allow a single company to own and I think that it is really sad that you think that this is a good idea. And it is really sad that you do not represent consumer interest.

and as a media consumer I am very upset about what you are doing as well as many of my freinds.

james tichenor

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.37.219.11
Remote IP address: 68.37.219.11